

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4, and 5 amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 5 was objected to and Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (JP 2001-275284).

Claims 4 and 5 are amended to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 (c). Claim 1 is amended to recite “each said stator core has a wide base portion connected to a narrow bobbin portion around which said coil is wound, and said wide base portions of said stator cores are connected to one another with pressure so as to form a ring-shaped yoke by mounting said stator cores around said housing bush.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ originally filed specification.¹ No new matter is added.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the personal interview between the Examiner and Applicants’ representative on June 29, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner acknowledged that Kondo does not disclose or suggest the stator core structure shown in Applicants’ originally filed Figure 2. The Examiner also acknowledged Applicants’ right to be their own lexicographer as well as the support in Applicants’ originally filed specification for the recitation of a stator core ‘bobbin section.’

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a permanent-magnet type electric rotating machine that includes a rotation axis; a rotor that rotates together with the rotation axis; and a stator that rotatably supports the rotation axis. The rotor has a closed-end-cup-shaped holder that is mounted at one end of the rotation axis and a permanent magnet fixed on an inner surface of a cylindrical portion of the holder. The stator has a

¹ Specification, Figure 2.

housing bush that supports the rotation axis in an axis hole formed through the center thereof. That stator also has stator cores that are radially and directly mounted around the housing bush to face the outer tip ends thereof to said permanent magnet with an air gap and coils that are wound around the stator cores via insulators. Each stator core has a wide base portion connected to a narrow bobbin portion around which the coil is wound. The wide base portions of the stator cores are connected to one another with pressure so as to form a ring-shaped yoke by mounting the stator cores around the housing bush. The present invention provides for more economical construction and reduced part count.²

Kondo discloses salient poles (equivalent to the stator cores) 17 fixed to a yoke 14 to form a stator 13, with a bearing housing (equivalent to housing bush) 26 fixed to the stator 13 by the screw 28.³ That is, each of the salient poles 17 are not directly mounted around bearing housing 26. Also, in Kondo, the stator core is T-shaped⁴ as the salient poles 17 do not have the wide base portions to form the ring-shaped yoke shown in Applicants' Figure 2 and as recited in Applicants' amended Claim 1. Thus, Kondo requires the yoke 14 to be a separate component, which increases component count and the steps of working process.

As none of the cited prior art, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest all the elements of independent Claim 1, Applicants submit the inventions defined by Claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated and are not rendered obvious by the asserted prior art for at least the reasons stated above.⁵

Applicants also traverse the Official Action's finding that Kondo discloses the flat portion recited in Applicants' Claim 3; the nicks and bracket-mounting portion recited in Applicants' Claim 4; and name of material of the housing bush and manufacturing method

² Specification, page 2, lines 16-21.

³ Kondo, paragraph 0017.

⁴ Kondo, Figure 3.


⁵ MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaack, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."

recited in Applicants' Claim 5. However, these arguments are moot in view of the above-discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/MEM/kkn

I:\ATTY\MM\AMENDMENT\3641\240300US-AM.DOC